

02-277

From: Hedi Saraf
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 3:18 PM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

Hedi Saraf (connecthedi@earthlink.net) writes:

Dear Commissioner Adelstein, Thank you for conducting the hearings in SF last weeke-end. I was not able to attend, but did listen to a great deal of it on KPFA. I want to applaud your stance and urge all of the commission to uphold what little regulatory powers are still in place.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 209.179.192.106
Remote IP address: 209.179.192.106

From: itzam
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 3:18 PM
Subject: please p54otect our interests

please vote against relaxing the law regarding monoploy purchasing of our
air ways. please protect the democracy we have in hertied.
thank you?

From: ALLARDW@aol.com
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 3:21 PM
Subject: taking points

Dear Mr. Adelstein:

I urge you NOT to relax the broadcast rules that protect American citizens from media monopolies. These proposed changes would pave the way for giant media conglomerates to gain near-total control of radio and TV news and information in communities across our nation. And many of the corporations that are now lobbying the FCC to relax these ownership rules already have a known track record in attempting to keep opposing viewpoints off the air.

The American people deserve to hear more than one point of view on important issues. Therefore, for the sake of our democracy and our freedom, I urge you to continue the broadcast ownership protections that, for decades, have helped to ensure a healthy political debate in our country.

Sincerely,

William J. Allard
Bayville, NY 11709

CC: j'adelste@fcc.gov

From: Dallas Ferguson
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 3:40 PM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

Dallas Ferguson (dferguson@dsda.com) writes:

I have become increasingly alarmed as a result of what I have recently read and heard concerning the FCC's consideration--on 6/2/03, I believe--on recission of the rule which limits the number of media outlets that can be owned by one entity. I urge you to vote against recission of this rule.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 65.221.207.162
Remote IP address: 65.221.207.162

From: ScallonSmash466@aol.com
To: Michael Copps
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 3:47 PM
Subject: media consolidation proposal

I oppose the proposal to allow media consolidation scheduled for a June 2 vote. Such a proposal is contrary to the free flow of ideas and debate with which a democracy thrives. The concentration of the power of mass communications in the hands of the enemies of democracy such as Ruppert Murdoch (FOX), DISNEY (ABC), GE (NBC) & CBS has only served to stifle debate and reduce journalism to the lowest common denominator. I also call upon Michael Powell to resign his position with the FCC in acknowledgement that he has betrayed the public trust by even suggesting such a contemptable proposal.

CC: Mike Powell

From: MW12702@aol.com
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 3:48 PM
Subject: Broadcast ownership rules..

I urge you not to relax the broadcast ownership rules that protect American citizens from media monopolies. these proposed changes would pave the way for gaint media conglomerates to gain near total control of radio and television news and information in communities across our nation. And many of the corporations that are now lobbying the FCC to relax these ownership rules already have a known track record in attempting to keep opposing viewpionts off the air. The American people deserve to hear more than one point of view on important issues. Therefore, for the sake of our democracy and the freedom, I urge you to continue the broadcast ownership protections that, for decades have helped to ensure a heathy political debate in our country.

Sincerely,

Michael S White

From: Philip DeFreest
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 3:52 PM
Subject: Broadcast Ownership Rules

Dear Mr. Adelstein:

I write urging you NOT to degrade or relax the rules for broadcast ownership that currently discourage and help prevent media monopolies. America's interests are not served by allowing a few corporate giants to totally control television and radio news.

The changes now being proposed and considered would allow a few corporations to buy and control most or all of the radio and television stations across the country and, in effect, control the news! Many of those now operating large networks or owning a number of media outlets have already demonstrated to us their desire and ability to stifle debate and to allow the presentation of essentially only one point of view. Our democratic society thrives on debate and it is imperative that opportunities abound for the expression of opposing viewpoints in every community across our great nation.

It is imperative that you take a stand to prevent these changes. The American people are becoming more and more dependent upon television and radio news as fewer and fewer options exist for unbiased print news coverage. Many of our nation's communities have only a single newspaper and, unfortunately, there seemingly are no barriers to media conglomerates owning and controlling large numbers of these outlets. You have and should retain the authority to prevent the monopolization of the airwaves.

I ask that you continue the present rules. The potential for abuse by the media conglomerates is too great a risk. Please maintain the current level of regulation.

Thank you.

Philip F. DeFreest
4 Meadow Lane
Rensselaer, NY 12144

From: L19FLUTT@aol.com
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 3:57 PM
Subject: prevention of media monopolies

The Honorable Michael K. Powell, Chairman

I urge you not to relax the broadcast ownership rules that protect American citizens from media monopolies. The large media conglomerates have in the past used their power to keep opposing viewpoints off the air. As an example, No where have I ever heard the media cite one example where a man using a legal weapon to defend himself and his family. Although there are many instances where this takes place, the media has controlled a blackout on this type on news. When some unauthorized person uses a weapon in a crime it makes the headlines and is repeated for sensationalism.

Sincerely,
James Cino

From: jg
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 3:58 PM
Subject: competition

Mr. Commissioner

It you really believe that "The FCC's strategic goal for competition is to support the Nation's economy by ensuring that there is a comprehensive and sound competitive framework for communications services", and that "Such a framework should foster innovation and offer consumers meaningful choice in services". If you really believe this quote from your own web site as I do, then how can allowing any further consolidation of radio, television of newspapers do anything but the opposite?

Mr and Mrs E. Goodson
235 Wetzel Way
Yreka, California 96997
joesson@hotmail.com

From: Raymond J. Kizior
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 4:00 PM
Subject: Don't Relax Broadcast Ownership Rules

Dear Commissioner Adelstein

Please don't relax the current broadcast ownership rules. To do so would in the end restrict diversity of opinions and therefore our free speech.

Ray Kizior
Exeter, RI

From: Brenda McMillan
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 4:03 PM
Subject: No more consolidation of the news media

Commissioner Powell,
What happened to anti-trust legislation. The bigger the Corporation the less responsive it is to the public.
These are our airways: the Telecommunications Act of 1934 should still govern the work of the commissioners, it is an Act that emphasizes the importance of the 'public interest.'
I'm tired and worried about the amount of violence shown on TV - this is not in the public interest. We need more in-depth news - this is expensive and will not be given by big corporations who only look for profits.
Give us more access to local TV and radio.
Above all, don't rush this process delay the decision a few months, it will make a difference in the amount of public feed-back to will receive.
Sincerely, Brenda McMillan, Freida Imislund, and Rosemary Russell
2929 Sheridan St., Port Townsend, WA 98368

From: Doug Hirte
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 4:07 PM
Subject: Media Monopolies

Dear Chairman Powell:

I am concerned that the proposed rule change(S) will defeat the present law and applicable rules which serve to prevent media monopolies. If these changes are adopted, independent voices across this Country will be snuffed out by the already huge media corporations.

Whole communities, states and possibly regions could be dominated by one media company which could decide which viewpoints to 'allow' on the air and which to censor.

Media Conglomerates have historically used their power to silence opposing viewpoints. These proposed rule changes would give them far greater power to keep opposing views off the air and out of the newspapers.

Many of the corporations that are fighting for these rule changes-including media giants Viacom/CBS and Disney/ABC-are precisely the very same elitist, leftist, anti-freedom companies that have in the past used their positions and power to silence emerging-opposing views.

Sincerely, Doug Hirte

From: ARTHUR TORGERSEN
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, Commissioner Adelstein, KM
KJMWEB
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 4:14 PM
Subject: BROADCAST OWNERSHIP RULES-DO NOT RELAX

I urge you not to relax the broadcast ownership rules that protect American citizens from media monopolies. The American people deserve to hear more than one point of view on important issues. For the sake of our democracy and our freedom, I urge you too continue the broadcast ownership protections.

Sincerely yours,
Arthur L. Torgersen

From: jarcp@onebox.com
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 4:18 PM
Subject: Broadcast ownership rules

Dear Mr. Powell,

I urge you not to relax the broadcast ownership rules that protect American citizens from media monopolies.

These proposed changes would pave the way for giant media conglomerates to gain near-total control of radio and television news and information in communities across our nation. And many of the corporations that are now lobbying the FCC to relax these ownership rules already have a known track record in attempting to keep opposing viewpoints off the air.

The American people deserve to hear more than one point of view on important issues. Therefore, for the sake of our democracy and our freedom, I urge you to continue the broadcast ownership protections that, for decades, have helped to ensure a healthy political debate in our country.

Sincerely,
Ron Reed
1209 S.W. 129th Street
Oklahoma City, OK 73170
405-691-2296
jarcp@onebox.com - email

From: Patricia Dunham
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 4:23 PM
Subject: RE:Media Ownership

Chairman Powell,
I hope that you will not recommend loosening the media ownership rules.
Freedom of speech and a right to be heard are the foundation of this
country. Monopolies of 4 or 5 corporations does not benefit a
"Democracy."
Pat Dunham

From: Doug Hirte
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 4:26 PM
Subject: Media Monopolies

Dear Commissioner Adelstein:

I am concerned that the proposed rule change(S) will defeat present law and applicable rules which serve to prevent media monopolies. If these changes are adopted, independent voices across this Country will be snuffed out by the already huge media corporations.

Whole communities, states and possibly regions could be dominated by one media company which could decide which viewpoints to 'allow' on the air and which to censor.

Media Conglomerates have historically used their power to silence opposing viewpoints. These proposed rule changes would give them far greater power to keep opposing views off the air and out of the newspapers.

Many of the corporations that are fighting for these rule changes-including media giants Viacom/CBS and Disney/ABC-are precisely the very same elitist, leftist, anti-freedom companies that have in the past used their positions and power to silence emerging-opposing views.

Sincerely, Doug Hirte

From: Claire Burt
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 4:27 PM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

Claire Burt (pdxburt@access4less.net) writes:

Dear Commissioner Adelstein,

Only last night on PBS's Now with Bill Moyer, did I learn of the media consolidation vote scheduled for June 2. This meeting should be postponed until further public discussion and debate is offered. I am very concerned that the FCC will actually support this initiative; the implications of which will be detrimental to the public interest. Already there is evidence of the adverse effect of so few corporations controlling so many of our airwaves. The coverage of the war with Iraq is a prime example. Compared to the coverage offered by the BBC, PBS, and PRI, the majority of news outlets demonstrated a narrow, biased, sometimes inflammatory account of the events surrounding the war and often simply repeated White House/Pentagon scripted "news" without any real effort to engage in investigative reporting.

As I understand the function of the FCC, the commission is responsible for guarding the public interest of the United States, not the financial interest of a few corporations. Action to further media consolidation will surely benefit the 10 companies that already own 90% of entertainment and news outlets; and in doing so, the FCC will fail in its obligation to protect the public's right to fair, balanced reporting.

Please, consider more debate on this very sensitive issue before taking a vote. Or, simply vote no, in the interest of the American public that you so effectively serve.

Thank you,
Claire France Burt

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 64.158.121.66
Remote IP address: 64.158.121.66

From: Bob Royce
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 4:41 PM
Subject: New Broadcast Ownership Rules

Pleas do not relax the present rules. The media is already dominated to a great extent by ABC, NBC, and CBS and reporting has almost dissappeared. We get what they want us to hear, and with biased commentary. Seldom the NEWS. Please, if anything, tighten up the situation. Thank you.

Most sincerely,
Robert S. Royce

From: bernbilly@juno.com
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 9:52 AM
Subject: Media in America

We are concerned that the consolidation of the media in America will lead to sterile, mindless programming, lacking any public service. Even now, one has only to see what has happened in radio around the country: the "play lists", required at monopoly-owned stations, dole out "fast-food" music, the same everywhere. Please do not allow a few owners to control TV and radio, while also owning other public information sources.

B & B Snovell, Williamsburg, VA

From: Louredhk@aol.com
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 9:52 AM
Subject: (no subject)

Dear Mr. Adelstein:

I urge you not to relax the broadcast ownership rules that protect American citizens from media monopolies.

These proposed changes would pave the way for giant media conglomerates to gain near total control of radio and television news and information in communities across our nation. And many of the corporations that are now lobbying the FCC to relax these ownership rules already have a track record in attempting to keep opposing view points off the air.

The American people deserve to hear more than one point of view on important issues. Therefore, for the sake of our democracy and freedom, I urge you to continue the broadcast ownership protections that, for decades, have helped to ensure a healthy political debate in our country.

Thank you,
Louis Molinari
Red Hook, NY 12571-1207

From: Dennis & Sheila Brogger
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 9:59 AM
Subject: Broadcast ownership rules

I am writing to urge you to leave the current broadcast ownership rules as they are, do not change them! They were adopted to keep organizations from acquiring a monopoly on the news and editorials throughout a region/state/or the country. They have served us well for a long time. If you change the rules, as requested by some of the media giants, the democratic and political process in this country would suffer. Whole communities, states, or an entire region could be dominated by one large media conglomerate, which would decide what viewpoints to allow on the air and what to censor. Some of these companies (Viacom/CBS, Disney/ABC) have already used their power to keep opposing viewpoints off the air, and the proposed changes would give these companies even greater power.

If representative democracy and constitutional government is to survive in the United States, it is essential that all issues be thoroughly debated and opposing viewpoints equally and fairly presented. If that happens, I have total faith that the American people will come up with the answer to our problems. We, the people, do not need to be dictated to by self serving elitist national new organization (s), have the news edited to what is politically correct, and to have only one side of an issue presented. We want fairness, which we do not get from the big media conglomerates. Indeed, I believe that they now have too much power, and would propose that that power be reigned in. They should be broken up into smaller units. They should be required to accept paid political advertisements and messages whether they agree with the message or not. They should be required to offer free time to opposing viewpoints whenever they offer free time to proponents of a viewpoint that they support.

Think about our history! What would have happened in the 1770s if all the newspapers had been controlled by one or two corporations owned and controlled by Loyalists or the English King? The American Revolution would not have happened.

If you change the rules, the concept of George Orwell's "1984" may not be too far off, with all news and political opinion censored to what is "politically correct" by one or two conglomerates rather than an all pervasive government. That government and conglomerate would however be totally tied together, because the conglomerates would control the political debate and in effect, the government.

Thank You for allowing me to share my comments and opinions!

Dennis A Brogger

From: Louis Pratola
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 9:59 AM
Subject: media monopolies

Do not relax broadcast rules. Media giants are already censoring viewpoints by rejecting paid time. If anything, rules should be strengthened to provide a more balanced view. Louis G Pratola Toms River NJ

CC: Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein

From: Robert Krikorian
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 10:02 AM
Subject: June is too soon to vote on the historic FCC reg changes

Please reschedule implementation and acceptance of historic FCC changes from your June meeting to a future meeting. I agree that much more discussion needs to take place and hearings held.

Bob K

From: mfouch@juno.com
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 10:12 AM
Subject: No to corporations, YES to the people!!!

To The Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission
Dear Chairman Powell

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE ARE VERY DISAPPOINTED IN THE FCC!!!

It has become apparent recently that the FCC Act of 1996 was a mistake. It has ended up giving far too much power to biased, politically motivated corporations like Clear Channel Communications. They wield far too much power in this country thanks to their ability to buy up all the stations that law allowed them to do.

Now you are considering giving even more of THE PEOPLE'S airwaves away to an even MORE CONCENTRATED GROUP of corporations!!!!

Just because the present law is old does not mean it is out dated! Since when are American values like democracy, equal representation, and fairness to all people out dated? The constitution is way over 200 years old and still going strong!

Think about the long-term consequences of these changes! These will NOT be good for America, only good for a few corporations bottom lines!

Have we become a corporatocracy rather than a democracy? Are you not working to for the good of THE PEOPLE rather than the corporations?

Please PROTECT OUR RIGHTS to keep an open and fair country by allowing diverse voices to continue to be heard, not just the few powerful corporations!

If anything is needed, more stringent rules breaking up the powerful conglomerates that already exist and are having a devastating influence upon our air waves are needed. Yes, and BRING BACK THE FAIRNESS DOCTRINE...HOW DARE YOU TAKE THAT AWAY FROM OUR SYSTEM! Look what has happened in its absence! American radio has become a propaganda arm of the Neo Conservative fringe who certainly do not represent the broad American values, and yet have to power to influence the direction of the whole country because of their total domination of radio! That was the legacy of the Reagan-era Conservative push for change and look what it led too! How can you say you are protecting the people with decisions like that?

THE PEOPLE of the United States DEMAND BETTER REPRESENTATION THAN THIS!!!

DO YOUR DUTY TO PROTECT US NOW and IN THE FUTURE ...to help make sure our Democracy survives!

Sincerely -

Michael Fouch
mfouch@juno.com

11649 Co. Rd. 48
Fairhope, Alabama
36532

CC: kabernathy@fcc.gov, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein,
fcoleman@mobilerregister.com, senator@kennedy.senate.gov, senator@sessions.senate.gov,
senator@shelby.senate.gov, jo.bonner@mail.house.gov